How Did Lovestone Get Marshall Plan Funds For Hanky-Pank? P. 2

Just A Suggestion

Now that the Greek Army, in taking over and renovating Greece (possibly with the aid of our CIA), has removed the Primate and put its own man in as head of the Orthodox Church, couldn't the CIA, perhaps working through the Swiss Guard, get that peacenik out of the Papacy and replace him with somebody reliable like Spellman?

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XV, NO. 18 MAY 22, 1967 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

If Daddy Keeps At It, Luci, One Day You Won't Wake Up

The President's now famous "World War III" bedtime remark to his daughter, Luci, deserves closer examination. The story has been circulating in the press corps on an off-the-record basis for months. Mr. Johnson has told it so often that it is surprising it did not get into print sooner. It seems to have become one of his favorite anecdotes. One can understand a worried President telling his daughter the night of the first air raids in the immediate vicinty of Hanoi and Haiphong, "Your Daddy may go down in history as having unleashed World War III," adding, in case that was not enough to get her attention, "You may not wake up tomorrow." But it is hard to understand the mentality that can tell and retell the story as if it were some kind of creditable escapade. A James Reston column last November 4 quoted Johnson as saying he had been on tranquillizers since his heart attack in 1955. If this is how lightly Johnson risks a world war, the rest of the country had better start taking them too.

The Very Next Day

The most extraordinary aspect of this affair has gone unnoticed. The day after the remark to Luci, Johnson flew out to Omaha for a speech in which he told the people of this country, "peace is more within our reach than at any time in this century." This should add a few miles more to that credibility gap. Ever since Johnson made his first major escalation in February, 1965, by beginning the bombing of the North, there have been repeated hints in the press that Hanoi and Haiphong were to be left alone because Peking or Moscow or both might intervene if the capital and the main port of North Vietnam were smashed. It has been impossible to ascertain if these hints reflected discreet warnings from the Russians and Chinese or discreet reassurances from Washington. Now we learn from the Luci anecdote that Johnson, in authorizing air strikes for the first time within the immediate vicinity of Hanoi and Haiphong felt that he was risking World War III. The country was neither consulted nor advised on the gravity of that step. On the contrary it was deceived. The only sense in which it could truthfully be said that peace was then "more within our reach than at any time in this century" was if those air raids had set off a full-scale nuclear confrontation between U.S. and U.S.S.R. and with it a peace of extinction.

The only charitable explanation is that when Johnson spoke of peace that day in Omaha and again at Des Moines, he meant the surrender of the other side and had been sold the idea by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that these bombings were worth the risk because they offered a quick victory. The June 29 raids opened three weeks of savage attack on the oil installations in and around Hanoi and Haiphong. The briefings in Saigon and the press conference held by Secretary McNamara the day they began created the impression that this was a swift and easy way to dry up North Vietnam's aid to the guerrillas. McNamara said the raids were ordered "to counter a mounting reliance by North Vietnam on the use of trucks and powered junks to facilitate the infiltration of men and supplies into South Vietnam." Triumphant headlines appeared next day over the Navy's claim that two miles from the center of Haiphong its fliers had hit installations representing 40% of North Vietnam's oil storage capacity and 95% of its tanker-unloading capacity and left them 80% destroyed. From these first headlines one would have imagined that henceforth only a trickle of light arms transportable by bicycle and foot would reach the South while the economic life of the North would be crippled.*

Now almost a year later, it is clear that the sequel of these raids was a sharp escalation in the volume and size of the arms and ammunition supplied. There has been an extraordi-

(Continued on Page Four)

If A Chinese Army Were On Our Border

Sen. MORTON (R. Ky) — If 500,000 Communist Chinese troops were within 400 miles of the U.S., say in Mexico or Canada, and they started moving towards the borders of our country, we certainly would react very strongly, without worrying too much about whether we were wrong or right.

Sen. COOPER (R. Ky)—There would be an immediate reaction.

Sen. MORTON—And without any consideration of our strength as compared with theirs . . .

Sen. CHURCH (D. Idaho)—When American troops were moving into North Korea, ever closer to the Yalu, President Truman was repeatedly advised by those highly placed in the Pentagon and the State Department—one of whom was Dean Rusk—that the Chinese would never intervene . . . The Chinese did choose to intervene . . . (though) we were the only country in the world then possessed of nuclear weapons . . . if it (escalation) is to lead us into a war with China, then we face a tragedy the costs of which are impossible to calculate and the end impossible to foresee.

—In the Senate, May 15.

*** Few noticed, however, that 8 days later reconnaissance photos showed 70% of the installations were still in operation, Facts-on-File July 7. These sober revisions never seem to catch up with the original claims in this fallaciously precise numbers game.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Open Letter to Senator Fulbright From A Noted Crusading Labor Leader

How Did Lovestone Obtain Marshall Plan Funds For CIA-Type Activities?

Dear Senator Fulbright:

As a union official for a quarter of a century and author of many books on foreign affairs and labor, I'd like to draw your attention to a recent statement (May 9) by Jay Lovestone, director of the AFL-CIO international affairs department. In denying that his organization accepted money from the CIA, Mr. Lovestone admitted receiving "generous" sums from Marshall Plan counterpart funds. If true, this is as shocking as the CIA charge, for it means that the Marshall Plan was secretly involved in intelligence activities.

Behind the Iron Curtain

In mid-1965 Irving Brown, Mr. Lovestone's closest associate, told me: "We had relations with people behind the iron curtain through men such as Hans Jahn of the German railroad unions." Donald Robinson, in a laudatory article on Brown in the *Readers Digest,* records that Hans Jahn "told me about an undercover organization he has set up . . . Irving Brown helped us. . . . Much of what he [Brown] has done in the cloak-and-dagger realm cannot be recounted. It would endanger the lives of his associates and jeopardize their missions." The *New York Times* (October 10, 1948) reported that the Free Trade Union Center in Exile, formed with the help of the AFL, "appears to have at its disposal a working intelligence system."

Counterpart funds were supposed to be spent exclusively by agreement with the specific nation receiving Marshall Plan aid, and within that nation's borders. It would have been illegal to spend it on such activities as those of Herr Jahn or the Free Trade Union Center in Exile, first because it was international in scope and secondly because it was of an intelligence nature. The Marshall Plan was formulated to increase national production and living standards, not to engage in intelligence.

Mr. Lovestone's claim of receiving counterpart funds needs review for other reasons. A major activity of the Lovestone-Brown team was to split the French and Italian labor movements. It is well-known too that Mr. Brown aided a man named Ferri-Pisani in smashing a strike of dockers in Marseilles who refused to unload munitions. Was this too financed by Marshall Plan monies? Did France and Italy approve?

Furthermore, Mr. Lovestone's statement refers only to Italy, Germany, and France. It does not account for the impressive sums made available to union officials in Japan, Africa, India, Vietnam, Latin America, nor for the monies given to unionists in British Guiana during the 1963 general strike aimed at overthrowing the Cheddi Jagan government.

All of this is highly disturbing. It implies that not only the CIA but agencies set up for economic aid are involved in intelligence and in clandestine activities. If Mr. Lovestone's claim is valid it means that private individuals and private organizations are, in part, making American foreign policy, and doing it secretly without any possibility of review either by the rank and file of the American trade unions or the American people. I hope you will investigate.

Sidney Lens

Despite All That Bombing

"Saigon—Despite the recent escalation of the air war against North Vietnam, Communist troops now are better supplied with heavy ammunition than ever before. The enemy's ability to move his supplies is being demonstrated daily in the current fierce fighting between U.S. Marines and North Vietnamese regulars along the DMZ (demilitarized zone). Less than a year ago a mortar barrage of 50 or 60 rounds was unusual. But since early February the U.S.-Vietnamese positions at Gio Linh have been hit with nearly 15,000 rounds of mortars, rockets and artillery. One of the main reasons is that heavy concentrations of enemy anti-aircraft batteries in and near the DMZ have reduced U.S. aerial observation. Anti-aircraft fire is so thick that light aircraft are barred from the area and observation is handled by jets that fly 7,000 feet up to avoid being shot down. The results are much less satisfactory. An even greater problem is that Navy vessels have failed to stem the flow of supplies arriving by sea. Another factor is that the latest intensification of the air war has not been aimed at the flow of material to the south—hitting North Vietnamese jet airfields, the steel mills, the power plants—have been more 'punitive.'"

—*Ray. R. Coffey,* Chicago Daily News, *May 13 (abr.)*

Guaranteeing Freedom of Choice, Ky's Choice, That Is, In South Vietnam

Premier Ky, a Hitler admirer whom we are trying to retread as a democratic leader, seems to have novel views of constitutionalism. He has not only announced his candidacy for President, but his readiness for a coup should he lose. He told reporters during a visit to a refugee village near Saigon that if he were defeated by a Communist or a neutralist, "I am going to fight him militarily." Ky has already shown a gift for defining these terms broadly.

Ky's excuse for a coup is, as he put it, "In any democratic country you have the right to disagree with the views of others." This right, if you are a military man, apparently includes the right to overthrow them if they defeat you in an election. The right of disagreement, however, does not (in Ky's book) extend to civilian disagreement with the military. For in the same talk with reporters he announced that press censorship—and the censors are Ky's military—would continue during the election campaign now beginning. So Ky's men will control the press while he is running for President.

South Vietnam's new Constitution was unanimously adopted by the Assembly on March 18 and unanimously approved by Ky and the military council next day, to take effect in 30 days. Though its guarantee of press freedom is full of loopholes none envisaged continuation of press censorship by the military. We ask again: how do you have a free election without a free press?

We are continually astonished at how insensitive U.S. editors are to this issue. Of the four Sunday May 14 papers in which we saw the AP dispatch from Laithieu, South Vietnam, reporting these statements by Ky, only one—the New York Times—left in the paragraph in which Ky said press censorship would continue during the presidential campaign. Neither the Washington Post nor the Washington Star nor the Baltimore Sun printed this part of the AP story, though in our opinion the most important part of all. Is this how we stand guard over freedom of choice for the people of South Vietnam?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

McNamara Turns Up for The Miners and the First AEC Negro Member Against Them

The Snail's Pace of Action Against Lung Cancer in Our Uranium Mines

The oldest hazard associated with nuclear industry was observed long before the atom bomb but the U.S. government has just issued its first order dealing with it. This is the high incidence of lung cancer among uranium miners. A high death rate was noticed centuries ago in certain famous German and Czech mines which have been producing silver and cobalt since 1500, but also contain uranium and radium. The cause was first identified as lung cancer in 1880. Scientific studies in the 30s found that about half the miners had died of it and traced this to radioactivity. As a result the International Commission on Radiation Protection set strict health standards for uranium mines. The ICRP standard has just been made the legal one in this country for mines working on government uranium contracts, by Secretary of Labor Wirtz—over the objections of the Atomic Energy Commission and the industry.

Wirtz Treated As Dangerous Innovator

Four days after taking this long overdue step, Secretary Wirtz was called before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and treated as a radical innovator. Uranium interests have been fighting against adequate health standards since the cold war boom in uranium began in 1948.* The U.S. Public Health Service reported in 1955 that of 400 samples taken in 75 mines, radon concentrations were 20 to 230 times the acceptable level set by the ICRP. The AEC used a technicality to avoid responsibility. The Joint Committee went along, though Leo Goodman, the tireless and devoted nuclear expert of the UAW, called the dangerous situation to the Committee's attention in 1959. Goodman cited the success of the French government in reducing these hazards to safe limits by a ventilation and control system which added only 1 percent to operating costs. The problem was left to the mining States, which are under the thumb of the mining interests.

A series of articles by J. V. Reistrup in the *Washington Post* this spring and some tart editorials in the same paper seem finally to have put a burr under the saddle of the bureaucracy. The Federal Radiation Council which was established by Eisenhower in 1960 presumably to focus authority in these matters met on the problem May 4. Of the seven members of the FRC, the representatives of AEC, Agriculture and Defense voted against, and those of Labor, HEW and Interior for the ICRP level, as proposed by Secretary Wirtz. The seventh member, Commerce, evaded the taking of any position. An FRC decision would have been a toothless "advisory" recommendation only.

Next day Wirtz, reminded by the *Washington Post* that he had power to act under the Walsh-Healey Act, issued an order on May 5 making it mandatory for mines working on government contracts to abide by the safety level set years ago by the ICRP. The Interior Department was given authority to set such standards for all mines in an act passed by Congress last year but has been waiting for a recommendation by the FRC. The surprise of Wirtz's appearance before the Joint Committee May 9 was his revelation that Secretary McNamara had reversed the action taken by the Pentagon representative on the FRC and was supporting Wirtz. This gives him a majority.

The Joint Committee gave Wirtz a rough going over. Its senior House member, Holifield, who rotates in the chairmanship and was once a liberal, sneered at Wirtz's "high and noble sentiments" (see box below) and commented that we could also "stop every death on the Washington-Baltimore highway by closing down that highway." The nuclear establishment trotted out the first Negro member of the AEC, Dr. Samuel M. Nabrit, Jr., of Texas Southern, to testify in favor of an alternative health standard favored by the mining interests and proposed by Dr. Paul C. Tompkins, the AEC smoothie who became executive director of the FRC. Wirtz said the Acting Surgeon General had testified that this standard would mean a future lung cancer death rate among uranium miners of 3 times the normal rate.

*** In that year the AEC to induce expansion set an effective price of $18 a pound for uranium oxide, then selling at $1.60. The AEC still guarantees $8 a pound as against a world price of $4.30, though—as Chairman Pastore of the Joint Committee admitted at the Wirtz hearing—"We have enough uranium coming out of our ears" and the AEC—as a Washington Post editorial observed tartly the same day—only buys uranium "as an economic favor to the mines." Our nuclear stockpiles are scandalous for their "overkill" capacity. One high nuclear official said ruefully in a private conversation, "We have turned on the faucet and don't know how to turn it off."**

The Story That Sparked Action

"More than a thousand uranium miners in this country can be expected to develop lung cancer by the end of 1985, according to a study now receiving highly restricted circulation in the Executive branch of the government . . . A secret briefing paper within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare says that even the standards for limiting radiation now being considered by the interagency Federal Radiation Council would result in a cancer rate double that of the rest of the country."

—*J. V. Reistrup in the* Washington Post, *April 14.*

Noble Words Rendered Ironic By A 17-Year Delay Which Means Death for Many Miners

"After 17 years of debate and discussion regarding the private, State and Federal responsibilities for conditions in the uranium mines, there are today (or were when these hearings were called) no adequate and effective health and safety standards or inspection procedures for uranium mining . . . The best available evidence is that over two-thirds of the approximately 2500 underground uranium miners are working under conditions which at least triple their prospects of dying from lung cancer . . .

"The ultimate question here is whether an economic enterprise is to be required to satisfy the human values it affects or whether these values are to be compromised to serve the enterprise. This issue rarely arises in such clear, sharp outline. When it does, there is no more—or any more time—for compromise."

—*Secretary of Labor Wirtz to the Joint Committee May 9*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The "Pacification" Effort Was on the Verge of Collapse

(Continued from Page One)

nary increase in the firepower of the guerrillas (see box on p. 2). SAMs have appeared as far south as the demilitarized zone where they recently shot down a Skyhawk jet and forced suspension of B-52 flights in that area; the B-52 flies too low and too slowly to evade the SAM. The 140-mm rocket made its appearance in the attack on the Danang air base last February and on May 12 as far south as Saigon where it was used in the attack on Bien Hoa air base. There six Americans were killed, 100 wounded and 29 planes destroyed or damaged. American casualties are increasing. The number of both guerrilla and conventional clashes seem to have risen and the so-called "pacification" has had to be shifted to U.S. military control to save it from collapse. The South Vietnamese have failed to provide security: as against 25 attacks all last year on "pacification" teams there have been "more than 300 attacks this year on pacification teams and more than 500 team members have been killed or wounded." (Raymond Coffey from Saigon in *Chicago Daily News,* May 5). These CIA-trained teams have the job of "rooting out" suspected subversives in the villages; it is easy to imagine the injustice they commit and the hatred they sow.

Another Gamble Ahead?

What all this spells is the coming end of the politically comfortable war Johnson has so far waged—a war without special taxes or wage and price controls, a war of one-year tours of duty, fought by the less fortunate of our society, white and Negro, while the junior executive types of the politically powerful Reserve forces have escaped a call-up. Now the military forces are crying out for more troops or "we'll be here forever" as Hanson Baldwin's anonymous source put it in the *New York Times,* May 17. Here again it is worth looking back at the events of last June 29. Again there is the temptation to "go for broke" in one big new plunge, then at the oil resources of the North, this time perhaps to shut off Haiphong harbor altogether, again at the risk of a confrontation with Russia—anything rather than face the reality of a long, painful war of attrition on the ground against resolute guerrillas. Again Johnson would rather gamble on World War III than face elections next year with a country awakened to the painful costs.

McNamara said June 29 in announcing the new stepup in air raids that one of the purposes was to punish the North for continuing its attempt "to subvert and destroy the political institutions of the South." This is the myth that leads to disaster. If this is not a rebellion but a conspiracy and an invasion, why limit the punishment to North Vietnam? Why not hit at the sources in China and Russia? Why not make it painful for the Kremlin? The theory of the war as an external conspiracy which can be shut off like a faucet leads straight to a confrontation with Moscow. This is the inescapable logic of the Johnson-Rusk-McNamara theory of the war. This is the reason for the fresh outcries in the Senate. This is why U Thant warns that we may be in the first stages of World War III. This is why the Pope spoke in anguish at Fatima. Desperation, impatience, the oversimplification of a complex struggle are leading Johnson straight to a confrontation that would put world civilization in jeopardy.

The Stumbling Block to Peace Talks

Sen. AIKEN (R. Vt.)—There is no question that the present policy of escalating higher and higher is bringing us pretty close to a world calamity . . . Since escalation has not succeeded, I think it is entirely possible that deescalation might have a better effect, because no one can tell me that the North Vietnamese people, and Ho Chi Minh and his friends would not like to find some way out of this war themselves . . .

Sen. MORSE (D. Ore)—We never really made unconditional offers to negotiate . . .

Sen. PELL (D. R.I.)—The basic reef upon which negotiations between us, the NLF and the North Vietnamese founder is that our adversaries do not believe that we will accept a government that represents all the various factions of that unhappy country, South Vietnam . . . We did not accept with good grace the results of the Geneva conference . . . I think we will have to publicly agree to accept the results before going into a conference. I hope that we will do so.

—In the U.S. Senate, May 15.

"The Haunted Fifties" Is Out of Print But Random House Will Publish A New Collection of IFS Pieces, "In A Time of Torment" in November

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... **Zip**..... **State**.....

5/22/67

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... **Zip**..... **State**.....

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED